

REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

October 22, 2003

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Snodgrass, Commissioners Allen, Dunn, McCarthy, Parnell, Petitpas, Bluechel

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Marpert, Gibran Hashmi, Judd Black, Cathy Beam, Lori Peckol, Redmond Planning Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Snodgrass in the Public Safety Building Council Chambers.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. October 15, 2003

The minutes were approved as submitted by acclamation.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Ms. Nancy Bainbridge-Rogers, an attorney with Cairncross and Hempleman, 524 2nd Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, spoke representing Redmond Industries for a Clean Environment (RICE). She commented that when the shoreline policies and regulations were presented to the Commission they were packaged with a proposal for the imposition of a 250-foot-wide shoreline buffer along Bear and Evans Creeks in southeast Redmond. It has been pointed out that within the context of the Shoreline Management Act the maximum buffer can be only 200 feet. It appears that the larger number was solely derived from a staff review of literature discussing buffer widths of between 50 feet and 250 feet. Eventually the proposal was submitted to show the buffer width at 200 feet. The proposal was also amended to eliminate the opportunity for buffer averaging which currently exists under the city's sensitive areas ordinance. The current buffer widths along Bear and Evans Creeks are 100 feet or up to 150 feet as necessity requires, together with an allowance for buffer averaging which would allow a reduction to as little as 75 feet. RICE has been consistent throughout the process in explaining the adverse affects the proposed 200-foot buffer will have on the ability to redevelop their properties. It would be counterproductive to impose a flat 200-foot buffer along the two creeks. The results will be continued operations without any effort to improve or change them so as not to trigger any requirement to comply with the new development regulations.

Continuing, Ms. Bainbridge-Rogers noted that RICE hired Dr. Andrew Kendig to prepare a specific report on the question of how big the buffer should be in an urban area. A summary of Dr. Kendig's report was emailed to the Planning Commission members on October 22. In essence, his conclusion was that given the literature and the functions that need to be maintained in an urban environment, a standard buffer width of 100 feet is adequate. Moreover, he noted that the buffer width could be modified to be non-standard, or less than 100 feet, on the basis of site-specific studies conducted within the context of specific development applications. The study was conducted specifically pursuant to the Best Available Science guidelines of the State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development. The proposal to impose a 200-foot buffer for Bear and Evans Creeks should be eliminated in favor of the current 100-foot buffer in the Sensitive Areas Ordinance.

Commissioner Dunn asked if Dr. Kendig's report included a minimum buffer width recommendation or if there should continue to be buffered averaging allowed. Ms. Bainbridge-Rogers said she did not recall from reading the report if that recommendation was included. She observed, however, that if the city were to retain its current provisions, buffer averaging would allow buffers as low as 75 feet.

Chair Snodgrass wanted to know if any outside or peer review was made of Dr. Kindig's findings. Ms. Bainbridge-Rogers said she was not aware of any.

PUBLIC HEARING & STUDY SESSION

Watermark Credit Union (Seattle Telco) Drive-up ATM
Redmond Town Center, File L020198

Chair Snodgrass declared the public hearing open.

Mr. Jerry Sparrow, marketing director for Watermark Credit Union, said there are some 3000 members using the Redmond branch. The request before the city is to permit an ATM drive-up window to be installed near the branch in what is now a parking lot next to Cost Plus. The drive-up window will offer convenience and safety for the members. He shared with the Commissioners pictures of the branch building and drawings of the proposed ATM. In the immediate vicinity there are drive-up facilities at Bartell Drugs, Bank of America and Starbucks. He asked architect and planner Brian Reno to address the eight reasons cited by staff against allowing the proposed ATM drive-up.

Mr. Brian Reno, 1018 Bussy Highway, Park Ridge, Illinois, asked the Planning Commission to consider recommending Alternative B as outlined in the staff report. He answered the points made by staff. While the proposal does not specifically comply with the goals of the CC-2 zone, the design overlay area is specifically established to focus activity adjacent to the existing city center district and provide for pedestrian and automobile integration between the two areas. The existing development is fairly mature and as built does integrate pedestrian and automobile uses; the environment is not

exclusively pedestrian in nature as developed. The limited text amendment to allow a drive-up ATM in the zone should be permitted as outlined in Alternative B, which would allow for adequate controls on design, configuration, landscaping and screening.

With regard to the position of staff that the proposed drive-up ATM would result in increased vehicular circulation conflicts, Mr. Reno said the mature nature of the development of the area makes it highly unlikely that another drive-up use would come in conflict. Furthermore, the existing ordinances would prevent one drive-up from being located immediately adjacent to another drive-up.

The City's Technical Committee concluded that the proposed drive-up ATM would result in increased conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. Mr. Reno suggested that as proposed the design would eliminate conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. Nationwide surveys have shown that 70 percent of all financial institution transactions occur at drive-up facilities. Consumers left without the drive-up option are forced to drive to a facility, find a parking place, walk into the building and conduct their transaction, then walk back to their car and drive away. That approach serves to increase traffic in an area. Properly designed drive-up ATM facilities eliminate conflicts with pedestrians altogether.

The Technical Committee also found that the drive-up use would promote increased vehicle use in the area that is intended to be primarily pedestrian oriented. Mr. Reno pointed out that the zone is not exclusively pedestrian oriented as developed. Surveys have shown that customers do not want to drive more than a mile out of their way to use a drive-up ATM. Drive-up facilities are used primarily because they are convenient and safe. Such facilities decrease pedestrian/automobile conflicts in parking lots.

Mr. Reno said the Technical Committee concluded that the proposal will create increased traffic volumes. The fact is that drive-up facilities merely exchange lobby volumes for drive-up volumes. There is no net increase in traffic flow for a particular branch just because there is a drive-up facility included.

According to staff, a drive-up facility will not promote the CC-2 zone as a destination and will encourage the use of pass-by visits. Mr. Reno suggested that the proposed use will promote the CC-2 zone as a destination from the perspective that employees and customers of the credit union will not have to leave the zone site to make a deposit or get cash when they need it.

Drive-up ATM facilities do not contribute to motor idling and increased air and water pollution. The average drive-up transaction lasts 45 seconds. While there is some queuing that occurs, it is less polluting than driving around looking for a space, shutting off the car, and then restarting the car. As part of the application process, it was shown that the proposed drive-up facility will not pose any significant environmental hazard.

Commissioner Petitpas asked how many visits per day the proposed ATM will generate. Mr. Sparrow said the drive-up facilities located at the Lynnwood branch see an average

of 1,500 visits per month. Mr. Reno commented that the level of activity at any given drive-up ATM varies based on the market they are located in.

The final point of the Technical Committee was that the proposed drive-up is not needed given that other nearby locations, outside the zone, allow adequate auto-oriented uses. Mr. Reno held that by forcing shoppers, workers, members and nearby residents to leave the zone to locate a drive-up ATM for safety and convenience would increase auto traffic and congestion. He pointed out that the nearest drive-up facility is the one at Bank of America. Customers leaving that facility must turn right and thus drive away from these CC-2 zone and its shops and businesses. If their intent is to spend the cash they got from the ATM in one of the nearby businesses, they must travel through several intersections in making their way back to the shopping district.

Mr. Reno urged the Planning Commission to recommend allowing for the proposed drive-up ATM for the credit union to improve convenience and safety for customers of the area. The credit union relies on vehicular and pedestrian traffic from the immediate area. Drive-up facilities meet the intent of making the downtown an 18-hour destination. The credit union is committed to working with the city of Redmond staff in designing an acceptable and attractive and safe ATM facility.

Commissioner Allen asked if the credit union's walk-up ATM is available to customers 24 hours per day. Mr. Reno allowed that it is and that it is well lit. There are no designated parking spaces for the ATM. Commissioner Allen asked if there is another credit union within a half-mile radius and was told that it is the only credit union in all of Redmond.

Commissioner Allen asked if Watermark Credit Union waives ATM fees for other credit union members. Mr. Reno answered that it does.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if achieving the mark of having 70 percent of all credit union transactions occur at the drive-up facility would render the 5000-square-foot building too large. Mr. Sparrow said it would not, nor would the current employment level be reduced. Mr. Reno said the present building was designed to meet specific loan and deposit volumes. When designed it was assumed that eventually the facility would have a drive-up ATM.

Commissioner McCarthy asked how many other ATMs exist within a quarter mile or half mile. Mr. Sparrow said there are a number of major banks located in Redmond, all of which have ATMs. They are not all necessarily within a comfortable walking distance of the Watermark Credit Union branch. Credit union members using a non-credit union ATM would face the possibility of having to pay a surcharge for their transactions.

Commissioner McCarthy asked what percentage of the credit union's current ATM business occurs after hours. Mr. Sparrow said he did not know.

Commissioner Petitpas asked what security precautions would be added for the drive-up ATM. Mr. Reno said the credit union adheres to regulations first implemented in New York. They require that the immediate area must be well lit and must be designed so that no person can hide without being seen by a person using the ATM. All of the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design principles are considered. The proposed location is visible from Bear Creek Parkway and the shopping center.

Commissioner Bluechel asked if the proposal is being made because the credit union believes it will lose members if a drive-up ATM is not installed. Mr. Sparrow said the hope is that the facility will encourage existing members to remain with the credit union and entice others to become members. Mr. Reno added that the credit union facility at its original location was underperforming for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was lack of visibility. It was concluded that a new, larger and more visible facility would increase membership. Having a drive-up ATM will serve to increase the number of members.

Commissioner Bluechel asked why the current site was selected if the intent from the start was to include a drive-up ATM facility. Mr. Reno said there are several factors that go into selecting a site. Banks and credit unions do not draw people by themselves; people are drawn primarily because of convenience. That is why most financial institutions are located near shopping areas and supermarkets. The site was chosen based on its location and the level of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

Planner Gibran Hashmi shared with the Commission emails received during the day from Mike Eddy, address not given, a member of the bike/pedestrian committee; Duane Nakano, 7250 Old Redmond Road; and Christine Discoe, 2925 181st Avenue NE. Chair Snodgrass noted for the record that all three emails voiced opposition to the proposal.

Chair Snodgrass declared the public hearing closed and opened the study session.

Addressing some of the issues raised by the credit union representatives, beginning with the claim that drive-up facilities improve safety for customers, Mr. Hashmi said staff is not aware of robberies having occurred at any ATM in the city. There are lighting standards established by the state and the city, and the technical committee allows additional lighting for security reasons. Staff sees no particular risk for ATM facilities.

With regard to the claim that customers demand drive-up convenience, Mr. Hashmi said customers in Redmond Town Center are attracted to the development because there are a variety of shopping and business services. There is a demand for drive-up facilities, and the city has zones where such facilities are permitted; opening the CC-2 to drive-up uses is not a good idea.

The claim was made that a large share of bank and credit union establishments comes from drive-up transactions. Mr. Hashmi pointed out that there are several large banks in downtown Bellevue, some of which have drive-ups and some of which do not. They

benefit from the synergy that results from density. Watermark Credit Union is located in a prime location to take advantage of such synergisms.

Mr. Hashmi noted that the applicant also talked about drive-up ATMs as a key to business success. He said that with respect to the success of the community as a whole, there are benefits to be gained from people getting out of their cars and talking with their neighbors and developing relationships. Interaction is a key element of community.

Redmond Town Center has numerous locations where there are ATM machines. The fact that they are available contributes to the 18-hour nature of the area.

Staff agrees that Redmond Town Center is becoming a better business location. To a large degree that is the result of what the city, the community and the local businesses have fought and worked for. A drive-up facility could detract from that. Mr. Hashmi noted that there are Comprehensive Plan policies that argue against allowing drive-through uses in the CC-2 zone.

With regard to the comment made by Commissioner Bluechel at the last study session that the purpose statement does not establish the CC-2 zone as strictly pedestrian in nature, Planning Manager Judd Black explained that when Town Center was first conceived it was looked at as a pedestrian-oriented district. At the time terms like “pedestrian oriented” and “pedestrian friendly” were not commonly part of the zoning language. Since then the terms have become part of development language. The design criteria for Town Center, however, is full of descriptions that talk about pedestrian orientation. The mixed-use portion of the development came about first, and that is where most of the pedestrian orientation was built. During the second phase of development the store-front look was retained in the buildings. Pedestrian connections and walkways are part and parcel of the entire development.

Commissioner Petitpas allowed that while the intention from the beginning was for a pedestrian-oriented atmosphere, the reality is that it is not possible for people to use the area entirely on foot; they must still rely on their automobiles, often making several stops. It generally is not possible to shop at REI, Bed Bath and Beyond and Larry’s Market without using a car, unless all purchases are small.

Commissioner Dunn asked what the vision is for the development of the area that is currently a parking lot in front of Larry’s Market. Mr. Black said eventually, all of the area will look like a downtown. The large parking lots will be redeveloped in time and will look more like the main portion of Town Center. He said one of the concerns staff has with the proposal is that it would apply to the entire zone and not just the credit union site.

Commissioner Dunn asked how a large grocery store like Larry’s Market could function in an urban environment without a large parking lot. Mr. Black said they have been shown to work very well. The new Safeway in Queen Anne in Seattle is a prime example.

Commissioner McCarthy observed that if the blacktopped parking area goes away, there will need to be other provisions to accommodate the traffic. Mr. Black agreed that there would need to be some logistical planning involved, but said it could be done.

Commissioner McCarthy asked what the recommendation of staff would have been if the request had been to allow the drive-up ATM at the credit union site only and not for the entire CC-2 zone. Chair Snodgrass noted that absent a reasonable use issue the city would not even be able to entertain a variance request. Mr. Black concurred and said the issue must therefore be considered in terms of the entire zone.

Commissioner McCarthy said allowing drive-through uses in the entire CC-2 zone is a bad idea. On the other hand, regardless of the plan for Redmond Town Center, Bear Creek Parkway acts as a natural and psychological barrier to most of the pedestrian traffic in the area. The addition of a drive-up ATM at the credit union site would not be detrimental to any current or future use. Approving a use for the entire zone just to permit it at a single site would not be the right approach either.

Commissioner Allen said she does not want to see drive-through facilities allowed in the Town Center area. Such facilities fly in the face of the vision for Town Center and will bring increased traffic and pollution. There are problems that were created by allowing drive-throughs in close proximity; one example is Starbucks and Dairy Queen. She also voiced concern about siting a drive-through so close to the pedestrian and bicycle trail; the lines of idling cars will not be conducive to the trail users. She voiced no objections to having an ATM machine at the site, so long as it is not a drive-through.

Commissioner Bluechel said he would not vote to open the zone to drive-through facilities. The use is not appropriate to the area. He agreed that siting a drive-through ATM so close to the trail would not be appropriate even if the use were allowed in the zone.

Commissioner Petitpas concurred that the use should not be allowed in the CC-2 zone. She noted, however, that drive-up ATMs are very useful for the elderly and handicapped as well as others in the community. She agreed that it would not be appropriate to locate a drive-up facility adjacent to the trail.

Commissioner Dunn agreed with the statements made and for those reasons said she would not support allowing drive-up uses in the CC-2 zone. Adding the drive-through use would not be the right move when taking into account the vision for the area in the future. The credit union site offers a wonderful opportunity to integrate shopping with the trail; allowing a drive-through as proposed would limit that opportunity.

Commissioner Parnell said he also would vote to deny the proposal for the reasons stated.

Chair Snodgrass said his vote would be the same. He concurred with Commissioner McCarthy with regard to the comment that the area across Bear Creek Parkway does not necessarily belong in the CC-2 zone.

Motion to approve the staff recommendation to deny drive-through uses in the CC-2 zone was made by Commissioner Parnell. Second was by Commissioner Allen.

Chair Snodgrass commented that the credit union is a good neighbor, adding that the business reasons behind the proposal make good sense.

The motion carried 6-1 with Commissioner McCarthy voting no.

BREAK

STUDY SESSION

Shoreline Master Plan, DGA 02-015

Motion to reconsider the issue of the buffer was made by Commissioner Allen. Second was by Commissioner McCarthy and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioner Parnell abstained from voting.

Principal Planner Cathy Beam pointed out that the Best Available Science is continuing to evolve. She noted that two weeks ago the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued the determination that there are three distinct populations of salmon in the greater Lake Washington watershed; formerly they recognized only two. That means all tributaries that empty into the Sammamish River, such as Bear Creek, Evans Creek and some smaller streams, are hosting a different population of salmon. There will likely be greater pressure from NMFS to establish adequate protections for the fish populations in all of the tributaries.

With regard to the Tri-County work, Ms. Beam said it is still valid. The focus of late has been on a shared strategy in which all of the various entities would participate and work together. Much of the Tri-County work has been folded into the shared strategy approach. There is also the WRIA-8 work ongoing into which much of the Tri-County information has been folded.

Chair Snodgrass asked if the third salmon population is genetically distinct from the other two. Ms. Beam answered that there are significant evolutionary units of salmon, particular species of salmon, and distinct populations. The latter is a distinction tied to where the fish return for spawning.

Chair Snodgrass asked why staff favors a fixed regulation over a site-specific approach. Ms. Beam said fixed regulations provide predictability; when a landowner comes forward

with a proposal, it is an easy matter to explain the regulations and requirements. Site-specific regulations are difficult to fit into the bigger picture and are much more difficult to implement.

Commissioner Dunn asked what the main differences are between a management zone and the buffer approach. Chair Snodgrass said “buffer” and “inner-management zone” are essentially interchangeable terms, though there are certain presumed uses that are allowed, such as stormwater facilities, roads and trails. The inner-management zone is a buffer; the outer-management zone permits otherwise permitted uses but limits them by impermeable surfaces and allowed land clearing.

Commissioner Dunn said it was her understanding that the issue of uses is separate from the issue of buffers. The buffer or management zone approach relates more to what activities are allowed. She asked if the move away from the more traditional approach to buffers toward the inner-management approach is a trend that will be seen with all buffers or only those associated with shorelines. Ms. Beam allowed that the trend currently is unique to shorelines. However, the issue may come up when the Sensitive Areas Ordinance is updated in 2004.

Commissioner Petitpas asked how many site-specific projects can be expected to come up in any given year. Ms. Beam suggested that there would be very few from along the Sammamish River. Along the reach of Bear Creek by Town Center the land has all been designated as open space, and there is a little section just to the west of Avondale Road where there is some development under construction. The area zoned for business park does have some potential for redevelopment. There are properties along Evans Creek that might seek redevelopment.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Bluechel, Ms. Beam said the Bear Creek Basin Plan was developed several years ago. The city signed an interlocal agreement with King County to implement the plan and a steward has been assigned to manage it. The plan addresses a number of elements, one of which is recommended minimum 150-foot buffer widths.

Commissioner McCarthy asked how much time might be added to the permitting process if the city were to adopt a site-specific approach. Ms. Beam said it would add many weeks or months to the process. There would be a need for consultants and a city expert, as well as involvement by NMFS, the State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and others.

Commissioner McCarthy said he is in favor of trying to maximize the creativity of all parties, a direction that leans toward establishing a site-specific approach. He added, however, that he would not want to see an approach that would add substantial amounts of time to the permitting process.

Commissioner Allen said she likes the Tri-County approach but also was hung up between the site-specific approach and the fixed regulation approach. Of most concern is the averaging approach under the inner management scheme. The presumption is made

that averaging the inner management zone without going below 75 percent of the standard width will not trigger any mitigation obligation. She said she was looking for site-specific involvement in those circumstances to make sure that where incursions are allowed into the inner management zone they occur in logical places. It appears that under the fixed regulations approach there are no mitigation requirements for the outer management zone. The fixed regulation approach includes no incentives for upgrading and repairing riparian corridors.

Chair Snodgrass pointed out that under the Tri-County approach that after averaging the structure and function of the inner management zone must be equal to the structure and function prior to averaging. In essence that is a no net loss approach.

Ms. Beam said her concern is that the approach could yield a buffer of 75 feet, which is less than half of what the current code requires.

Commissioner Bluechel argued that nothing will ever get any better unless there is some degree of flexibility allowed. The no net loss approach does not necessarily offer any improvement. He indicated a preference for establishing the largest buffer and not allowing any revisions to it. The areas along Bear and Evans Creeks are not urban but rather industrial in nature. By their very nature, industrial uses are more invasive to the environment. Allowing the uses to encroach on the buffer zones under a no net loss approach offers nothing to the public interest or the protection of the salmon. He said he is okay with the tri-county approach but is not in favor of allowing averaging. He added that he would recommend buffers of 150 feet and 50 feet.

Commissioner Petitpas said she also would support an approach that encouraged improvement over merely no net loss. She said she would like to see if the Tri-County approach could be improved on.

Commissioner Dunn suggested that it would be highly unlikely that time spent conducting a site-specific analysis would yield anything significantly different than the fixed regulation approach outcome would yield. She said that for that reason she would favor the highest level of moving toward establishing a fixed regulation approach with a bent toward the Tri-County scheme. In the next level down, the approach should lean toward the Tri-County management zone option. She agreed with the need to provide incentives to yield improvements.

Chair Snodgrass indicated his preference for the management zones approach. He suggested that the concerns can be addressed through tweaks. For instance, averaging could be allowed while requiring additional mitigation. He said he would favor imposing a 150-foot inner management zone buffer and 50-foot outer management zone buffer for Bear and Evans Creeks.

Ms. Beam said staff could support the 150/50 approach. The question remains whether or not there should be an inner and outer management zone for those areas where the buffer is proposed to be 150 feet; she recommended leaving those areas with a buffer of 150

feet. Where the buffer is 200 feet, it should be set at 150 feet and 50 feet. She said she would not be in favor of allowing averaging within the inner management zone. With regard to the site-specific approach, she said having no lower threshold will yield development proposals seeking the lowest number possible. That will put staff in a defensive position from the start.

Turning to the comments regarding the general requirements, Ms. Beam indicated general agreement. She did voice concern about the requirement regarding the harvesting of trees remaining in the outer management zone if approved by a timber plan, suggesting that the section is probably irrelevant. She noted that the reasonable use procedure is similar to the one used by the city but is more detailed and might be an appropriate area to fold into the Sensitive Areas update.

Chair Snodgrass asked the Commissioners where they stood with regard to the three general approaches: fixed buffer, site-specific, and fixed regulations. Commissioner McCarthy said his first preference would be for the site-specific approach. Chair Snodgrass and Commissioners Allen, Bluechel, Petitpas and Dunn indicated a preference for the Tri-County fixed regulation approach.

Commissioner Dunn said she would not recommend creating both an inner and outer management zone given that the outer management zone does not appear to create a significant difference. Ms. Beam allowed that under the Tri-County approach, stormwater management facilities could be located in the outer management zone. Commissioner Dunn asked what the outer management zone does that the existing regulations do not achieve. Ms. Beam said staff would research that issue and provide an answer at a future Commission meeting.

With regard to the size of the inner management zone for Bear and Evans Creeks, Chair Snodgrass and Commissioners Dunn and Petitpas indicated a preference for 150 feet. Commissioners Bluechel and Allen favored 200 feet, and Commissioner McCarthy said he would set it at 100 feet. There was agreement on the part of Chair Snodgrass and Commissioners Dunn, Petitpas, Bluechel and Allen to retain the 150-foot buffer for all other shorelines; Commissioner McCarthy favored reducing the buffer to 100 feet.

A straw vote was taken with regard to no averaging, averaging with no net loss, and averaging with required mitigation for the inner management zone. Chair Snodgrass and Commissioners Dunn and McCarthy stated a preference for averaging with mitigation. Commissioners Petitpas and Allen said they would favor averaging with mitigation depending on what the specific mitigations would be. Commissioner Bluechel said he would not allow averaging at all.

STUDY SESSION

2003-2004 Comprehensive Plan Update

– Designation of the Overlake Advanced Technology Center as an Urban Center

Principal Planner Lori Peckol said she received a call from staff at the City of Bellevue expressing concerns about the urban center designation for the Overlake area. She asked the Commission to defer making a final recommendation until staff has the opportunity to sit down with Bellevue and better understand their concerns. She estimated that at the most a two-week delay will be needed. There was agreement to take that approach.

Chair Snodgrass began the discussion focused on policy OV-52. Ms. Peckol said the recommendation from staff would be to indicate that the primary concept for the employment area is for moderate intensity research and development, and to also clearly state that residential uses are allowed but would need to be designed to be compatible with the adjacent employment uses. That language would place the onus on the residential use to be compatible with the commercial uses.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if it would be possible for future developments to run into a situation where the relocation of a business could cause consideration for the use to change, or if the use would remain constant despite the fact that the business may move out. Ms. Piccolo said the expectation for the employment use would remain constant.

Commissioner Dunn said there are a lot of variations that could trigger a change in use permit. While the change may still fit within the overall employment umbrella, the change may be to a use at a lower level, and that might be confusing. She asked if a residential use developed next to a vacant lot would have to screen or design for a future employment use. Ms. Peckol allowed that it would not. Should an employment use develop on the vacant site later, the onus would still be on the residential side should residents voice concerns. Commissioner Dunn suggested that the proposed language does not read in that way.

Commissioner Bluechel concurred, suggesting that removal of the word “existing” would make it read that way. Ms. Peckol concurred and said she would make the change.

Ms. Peckol said the proposal of staff is to delete policy LU-40. The recommended policies speak to the appropriate range of uses and complimentary uses. To leave the policy in place would be redundant. There was consensus to delete the policy as proposed.

With regard to policy LU-121, Ms. Peckol said the proposed changes were triggered by a question asked by Ms. Bainbridge-Rogers. The policy refers to a land use designation that allows residential uses. The proposed changes are intended to make it clear that residential uses are allowed, and to reduce some of the repetitiveness in the language of the policy.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Parnell, Chair Snodgrass said residential developments within the area will more than likely be high intensity townhouses and condominiums. Ms. Peckol said she would need to verify it, but her initial thinking was that no single-family developments would be permitted in the Overlake urban center area.

REPORTS

Principal Planner Terry Mar pert provided the Commissioners with copies of a memo regarding the transportation and transit policy assessment. He said the bulk of the next meeting would be geared toward generating comments from the Commissioner regarding the assessments. There will also be a focus on the interaction between land use and transportation.

Mr. Marpert informed the Commissioners that the Council approved moving ahead with the NE 83rd Street design. The focus will be on making the street very attractive with wide sidewalks and possibly on-street parking.

Mr. Marpert said the Council also reconsidered their 4-3 vote regarding the NE 116th Street impact fees. The vote to reconsider was 4-2. The impact fees will not go into effect for the area. It is unknown what the eventual outcome will be.

SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

ADJOURN

Chair Snodgrass adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Recording Secretary:
